

Kathryn G. Spelman, Esq. (SBN 154512)
kspelman@mount.com
 Daniel H. Fingerman, Esq. (SBN 229683)
dfingerman@mount.com
 MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C.
 River Park Tower, Suite 1650
 333 West San Carlos Street
 San Jose, CA 95110-2740
 Telephone: (408) 279-7000
 Fax: (408) 998-1473
 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY INC.

Talley E. McIntyre (SBN 203131)
thenry@nixonpeabody.com
 NIXON PEABODY LLP
 One Embarcadero Center, 18th Floor
 San Francisco, California 94111-3600
 Telephone: (415) 984-8200
 Fax: (415) 984-8300

Maia H. Harris (*Pro Hac Vice*)
mharris@nixonpeabody.com
 NIXON PEABODY LLP
 100 Summer Street, 25th Floor
 Boston, MA 02110
 Telephone: (617) 345-1000
 Fax: (877) 670-8148
 Attorneys for Defendant
 SCHICK MANUFACTURING INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AERO PRODUCTS INTERNATIONAL INC.;
 BP LUBRICANTS USA INC.; BRK BRANDS
 INC.; CALICO BRANDS INC.; COOPER
 LIGHTING LLC; DAREX LLC; DEXAS
 INTERNATIONAL LTD.; DYNA-GRO
 NUTRITION SOLUTIONS; FISKARS BRANDS
 INC.; GLOBAL CONCEPTS INC.; HOMAX
 PRODUCTS INC.; KIMBERLY-CLARK
 CORPORATION; KRACO ENTERPRISES
 LLC; LIXIT CORPORATION; MEAD

No. CV10-02994-HRL

**JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER REGARDING SEVERANCE OF
 CLAIMS AGAINST SCHICK
 MANUFACTURING INC.**

Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel

Complaint Filed: July 8, 2010

WESTVACO CORPORATION; NUTRITION 21
INC.; OATEY CO.; OPTIMUM
TECHNOLOGIES INC.; NEWELL
RUBBERMAID INC.; SCHICK
MANUFACTURING, INC.; THE SCOTTS
COMPANY LLC; STERLING
INTERNATIONAL INC.; VITAMIN POWER
INCORPORATED; WOODSTREAM
CORPORATION; 4-D DESIGN INC,

Defendants.

Plaintiff San Francisco Technology, Inc. and Defendant Schick Manufacturing Inc. ("Schick")
hereby stipulate and agree that Defendant Schick shall be severed from this case. This stipulation is
made in light of the Court's ruling in *San Francisco Technology, Inc. v. The Glad Products Co.*, 2010
U.S. Dist. Lexis 83681 (N.D. Cal. 2010), where the Court determined that severance is appropriate in
a similar situation. Subject to the Court's approval, the parties request that the Clerk open a new case
number in *San Francisco Technology, Inc. v. Schick Manufacturing Inc.*

DATED: September 16, 2010

NIXON PEABODY LLP

/s/ Talley E. McIntyre
By: _____
Talley E. McIntyre
Attorneys for Defendant
SCHICK MANUFACTURING, INC.

DATED: September 16, 2010

MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C.

/s/ Daniel H. Fingerman
By: _____
Daniel H. Fingerman
Attorneys for Plaintiff
SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY INC.

1 In accordance with General Order No. 45, Rule X, I, Talley E. McIntyre attest that
2 concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

3
4 DATED: September 16, 2010

NIXON PEABODY LLP

5
6 By: /s/ Talley E. McIntyre
7 Talley E. McIntyre
8 Attorneys for Defendant
9 SCHICK MANUFACTURING, INC.

10 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, AND GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFOR, IT IS SO**
11 **ORDERED**

12
13 Dated: 9/27/10

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 By 
The Honorable Jeremy Fogel